



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# Modern Philology

VOL. I.

June, 1903.

No. 1.

## CHAUCER AND SOME OF HIS FRIENDS.

IN a well-known passage in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, Chaucer professes absolute neutrality in a sentimental debate which was amusing the leisure of high society in England:

For trusteth wel, I ne have not undertake  
As of the Leef ageyn the Flour to make,  
Ne of the Flour to make ageyn the Leef,  
No more than of the corn ageyn the sheef.  
For, as to me, is leefer non ne lother;  
I am withholde yit with never nother.  
I not who serveth Leef, ne who the Flour,  
That nis nothing the entent of my labour.  
For this work is al of another tunne,  
Of olde story, er swych stryf was begunne.<sup>1</sup>

This is one of Chaucer's characteristic disclaimers, and must not be taken too literally. Very likely he had not joined<sup>2</sup> either the Order of the Flower or that of the Leaf, but we are not to suppose that he did not even know which of his aristocratic friends belonged to one faction and which to the other. We are reminded of the solemnity with which he protests, in the *Troilus*, that he is a mere outsider in all the affairs of love.

The lines just quoted are good historical material. They show that English court society, in the time of Richard II, entertained

<sup>1</sup> Version A, vss. 71 ff. So, substantially, in version B, vss. 188 ff., but with "swich thing" for "swych stryf." For our present purposes it makes no difference whether A or B is the older version, and that very difficult question may therefore be ignored.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. vs. 76 with *C. T.*, Prol., vs. 511: "with a bretherhed to ben withholde."

itself by dividing into two amorous orders<sup>1</sup>—the Leaf and the Flower—and by discussing, no doubt with an abundance of allegorical imagery, the comparative excellence of those two emblems or of the qualities they typified. If we call in Gower's testimony also,<sup>2</sup> we are perhaps justified in supposing that the two orders sometimes appeared in force, each member bedecked with the symbol to which he or she had sworn allegiance. Such pageants would accord extremely well with the manners of the day, and it is possible that the pretty anonymous poem of *The Flower and the Leaf*<sup>3</sup> reflects the custom. In Gower's lines, however, the pageantry is applied to allegorical purposes, and the anonymous poem is not only allegorical, but also somewhat too late to be used without caution. We may return therefore to the Prologue to the *Legend*.

Just before the place quoted Chaucer makes his apology to certain contemporary poets:

For wel I wot that folk have her-beforn  
Of making ropen, and lad away the corn;  
And I come after, glening here and there,  
And am ful glad if I may find an ere  
Of any goodly word that they han left.  
And, if hit happe me rehersen eft

<sup>1</sup> Vss. 69, 70 of version A of the Prologue seem to suggest that all servants of love belong to one of these two orders:

Sith it is seid in forthering and honour  
Of hem that either serven Leef or Flour.

In other words, "Whatever I say in this book is said in furtherance and honor of all lovers." Cf. *Troilus*, i, st. 3. "Servants of love" and similar phrases, we should remember, were stock terms for "society people," who were all conventionally supposed to be desperately in love. So "lusty Venus children dere," in the *Squire's Tale* (vs. 272), means merely the young ladies and gentlemen at the court ball.

<sup>2</sup> *Confessio Amantis*, viii, vss. 2462 ff. (Pauli, Vol. III, p. 358; Macaulay, Vol. III, p. 453):

I sih wher lusty Youthe tho,  
As he which was a Capitein,  
Tofore alle othre upon the plein  
Stod with his route wel begon,  
Here hevedes kempt, and therupon  
Garlandes noght of o colour,  
Some of the lef, some of the flour,  
And some of grete Perles were;  
The newe guise of Beawme there,  
With sondri thinges wel devised,  
I sih, wherof thei ben queintised.

<sup>3</sup> Skeat's theory that *The Flower and the Leaf* was written by a woman has little against it. Still, there is no certainty. The fact that the author speaks in the person of a woman is not conclusive. Deschamps, for instance, does the same in a good many of his poems.

That they han in her fresshe songes sayd,  
 I hope that they wil not ben evil apayd,  
 Sith it is seid in forthering and honour  
 Of hem that either serven Leef or Flour.<sup>1</sup>

Curiously enough, all the editors of Chaucer have overlooked four poems by Eustache Deschamps which are of the first importance in the illustration of the Prologue to the *Legend*. They stand together in the authoritative manuscript of the works of Deschamps and may very likely have been written at about the same time. The third is a rondeau, the other three are ballades. The first<sup>2</sup> begins thus:

Qui est a choiz de deux choses avoir,  
 Eslire doit et choisir la meillour.  
 Et si me faut que je prengne, savoir:  
 De deux arbres ou la fueille ou la flour.

The author then compares the excellences of the Flower and of the Leaf and decides for the Flower, the refrain being

J'aim plus la fleur que la fueille ne face.

The second ballade<sup>3</sup> is in praise of the Flower and is of particular interest. The first stanza is as follows:

Pour ce que j'ay oy parler en France  
 De deux ordres en l'amoureuse loy,  
 Que dames ont chascune en defferance,

<sup>1</sup> Version A, vss. 61 ff. We need have no hesitation in taking this as addressed to contemporary poets rather than to the great of old. Chaucer is not speaking of the material of his *Legend*, but of what he intends to say in the Prologue itself in praise of the Daisy. Further, the language of version B is quite conclusive:

Allas! that I ne had English, ryme or prose,  
 Suffisant this flour to preyse aright!  
 But helpeth, ye that han conning and might,  
 Ye lovers, that can make of sentement;  
 In this cas oghte ye be diligent  
 To forthren me somewhat in my labour,  
 Whether ye ben with the Leef or with the Flour.  
 For wel I wot that ye han her-biforn  
 Of making ropen, and lad away the corn;  
 And I come after, glening here and there,  
 And am ful glad if I may find an ere  
 Of any goodly word that ye han left.  
 And though it happe me rehercen eft  
 That ye han in your fresshe songes sayd,  
 For-bereth me, and beth nat evel apayd,  
 Sin that ye see I do it in the honour  
 Of love, and eek in service of the flour (vss. 66 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> No. 764, Vol. IV, pp. 257, 258.

<sup>3</sup> No. 765, Vol. IV, pp. 259, 260.

L'une fueille et l'autre fleur, j'octroy  
 Mon corps, mon cuer a la fleur; et pourquoy?  
 Pour ce qu'en tout a pris, loange et grace  
 Plus que fueille qui en pourre trespasse  
 Et n'a au mieux fors que verde coulour,  
 Et la fleur a beauté qui trestout passe.  
 A droit jugier je me tien a la flour.

In the fourth stanza "Guillaume Fay, La Tremouille" is requested, apparently, to join the Order of the Flower. This person was chamberlain and marshal of Burgundy and met his death at Nicopolis<sup>1</sup> in 1396. The fifth stanza, however, enables us to come still nearer to the date of the poem, and is otherwise of particular significance:

Et qui vouldra avoir la congnoissance  
 Du tresdoulx nom que par oir congnoy  
 Et du pais ou est sa demourance,  
 Voist en l'ille d'Albyon en recoy,  
 En Lancastre le trouvera, ce croy.  
 P. H. et E. L. I. P. P. E. trace,  
 Assemble tout; ces .viii. lettres compasse,  
 S'aras le nom de la fleur de valour,  
 Qui a gent corps, beaux yeux et douce face.  
 Au droit jugier je me tien a la flour.

The lady here celebrated is of course Philippa, the eldest daughter of Chaucer's patron, John of Gaunt. Deschamps speaks of her as resident in Lancaster, and this, whether his words are to be taken literally or not, fixes one terminus for the date of composition. The Lady Philippa embarked at Plymouth on July 9, 1386,<sup>2</sup> to accompany her father on his expedition in quest of the Castilian crown,<sup>3</sup> and on February 2, 1387,<sup>4</sup> she was married to João I of Portugal. The ballade must have been written before the first of these two dates, and it may have been written several years

<sup>1</sup> RAYNAUD, *Œuvres de Deschamps*, Vol. X, p. 202.

<sup>2</sup> See KNIGHTON, Vol. II, pp. 207, 208 (TWYSDEN, cols. 2676, 2677).

<sup>3</sup> For the chronology of this expedition, with references to the original authorities, see *Englische Studien*, Vol. XIII, pp. 12 ff.

<sup>4</sup> DE SOUSA, *Hist. Geneal. da Casa Real Portuguesa* (Lisbon, 11 vols., 1735-45), Vol. II, p. 29. Cf. AYALA, *Cronica del Rey Don Juan el Primero*, año viii, cap. 6 (*Cronicas*, Madrid, 1780, Vol. II, p. 249); FERNÃO LOPEZ, *Chronica del Rey D. João I*, Part II, chaps. xciii, xciv-xcviii (Lisbon, 1644, Vol. II, pp. 222, 225 ff.); SOARES DA SYLVA, *Memorias para Historia de Portugal* (Lisbon, 1730-4), Vol. I, pp. 231 ff., Vol. IV, pp. 50 ff.

earlier, for Philippa was in her twenty-eighth year at the time of her marriage.<sup>1</sup>

The third poem<sup>2</sup> is a rondeau addressed to "tresdouce flour, Elyon de Nillac," and, like the preceding, rejects the Leaf in favor of the Flower.<sup>3</sup> It is very short, and affords us nothing of moment except this name. Héliion de Naillac was councillor and chamberlain of the French king.<sup>4</sup>

In the fourth,<sup>5</sup> however, a ballade in five stanzas and an envoy, Deschamps takes the side of the Leaf, and in the envoy he gives a list of distinguished Frenchmen who belong to that order:

Royne sur fleurs en vertu demourant,  
Galloys d'Aunoy, Mornay, Pierre ensemment  
De Tremoille, li borgnes Porquerons,  
Et d'Araynes Lyonnet vont loant,  
Et Thuireval vostre bien qui est grant;<sup>6</sup>  
Pour ce a fueille plus qu'a fleur nous tenons.

The significance of these four little poems to students of Chaucer needs no emphasis. They not only give direct testimony of the existence of the two orders in France, but one of them brings us close to Chaucer by informing us that Philippa of Lancaster was the great patroness of the Flower in England. It is hardly possible to doubt that this particular ballade was sent to the Lady Philippa by Deschamps—or by someone for whom he wrote it—and in that case it may well have been seen by Chaucer.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> According to her long and highly interesting epitaph, as printed by DE SOUSA, Vol. II, p. 32. Her husband was in his twenty-ninth year, on the same authority. The epitaph also informs us that she died July 18, 1415 (DE SOUSA, Vol. II, p. 35).

<sup>2</sup> No. 766, Vol. IV, p. 261.

<sup>3</sup> Very likely it was written to order for a lady to send to de Naillac.

<sup>4</sup> See RAYNAUD, as above, Vol. X, p. 215.

<sup>5</sup> No. 767, Vol. IV, pp. 262-4.

<sup>6</sup> See RAYNAUD's index under *Aunoy, Mornay, La Trémouille, Poquières, Araynes*. Thuireval has not been identified.

<sup>7</sup> It is now generally admitted that Chaucer's wife was the sister of Katherine Swinford, who was for some time governess of John of Gaunt's daughters, and whose career as the Duke's mistress and subsequently his wife is well-known. Is it possible that Chaucer put the following verses into the Doctor's mouth without thinking of his own sister-in-law?

And ye maistresses in your olde lyf,  
That lordes doghtres han in governaunce,  
Ne taketh of my wordes no displeaunce;  
Thenketh that ye ben set in governinges,  
Of lordes doghtres, only for two thinges:  
Outher for ye han kept your honestee,  
Or elles ye han falle in freletee,

And knowen wel y-nough the olde daunce,  
And han forsaken fully swich meschaunce  
For evermo; therfore, for Cristes sake,  
To teche hem vertu loke that ye ne slake.  
A theef of venisoun that hath forlaft  
His likerousnesse and al his olde craft  
Can kepe a forest best of any man.

—*Physician's Tale*, vss. 72 ff.

Indeed, it is far from improbable that in writing the passages which have been quoted from the Prologue to the *Legend* Chaucer had his eye on the four poems which Deschamps had devoted to singing the praises either of the Leaf or of the Flower.

May we not go a step farther? Everybody knows that Deschamps sent some of his works to Chaucer, along with a highly complimentary (if not always intelligible) ballade,<sup>1</sup> in which he praises the English poet's translation of the *Roman de la Rose*. He begs Chaucer to receive his "euvres d'escolier" graciously, and to send him something of his own in return—"de rescripre te prie, Grant translateur, noble Geffroy Chaucier." The return gift desired was of course a poem or poems, and indeed Deschamps makes the point plain enough by requesting a draught "de la fontaine Helye" to quench his thirst. If the manuscript which Deschamps sent to Chaucer contained the poems on the Flower and the Leaf, may not Chaucer have replied by sending him the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, or, indeed, the whole *Legend*, so far as it was ever completed? It is worth noting that there is a good deal about Chaucer's translation of the *Roman de la Rose* in the Prologue, as in the epistle of Deschamps to Chaucer, and further, that the list which Chaucer gives of his other works in that poem would have greatly interested Deschamps, who, when he wrote his epistle, apparently knew nothing of Chaucer's except the *Roman*.

There are no ascertained dates in the way of one who feels disposed to indulge in such conjectures as those just mentioned. The Prologue to the *Legend* is usually dated 1385,<sup>2</sup> and the ballade of Deschamps in honor of Philippa of Lancaster cannot, as we have seen, be put later than the middle of 1386, and may belong some years earlier.

There is an Englishman mentioned in Deschamps's address to Chaucer who deserves some notice, as being presumably a friend of both poets, and whom we shall find not without interest on his own account, though he has been completely neglected by Chau-

<sup>1</sup> No. 285, Vol. II, pp. 138-40.

<sup>2</sup> The arguments in favor of this date are far from conclusive—some of them, indeed, seem quite illusory—but the date itself is not unreasonable.

cerians. He is the *Clifford* from whom Chaucer is to receive the gift sent him by Deschamps:

Mais pran en gré les euvres d'escolier  
Que par Clifford de moy avoir pourras.

This undoubtedly is the same person to whom Deschamps refers as an authority on problems of love in a ballade addressed to the Seneschal d'Eu.<sup>1</sup> The writer says that he wishes to marry, and asks the seneschal to give him a written report on the following question:

Lequel vault mieulx a jeune chevalier  
Et a homme qui par le monde va,  
Belle dame, s'il se veult marier  
Qui jeune soit, ou moyenne qui a  
L'aage passé? Et laquelle prendra  
Pour le meilleur et pour joieuse vie  
Le chevalier?

If the seneschal is in doubt, he is to consult "the amorous Clifford:"

Et s'avisez n'estes de la partie,  
Demandez ent a l'amoureux Clifford.

The last-quoted verse is the refrain. In the envoy several French authorities are mentioned whom the seneschal is also requested to consult:

Seneschal d'Eu, mes cuers en vous se fie.  
Enquerez bien de ceste maladie  
Au Tourangoys, a Le Breth et au fort  
Au conte d'Eu, Harecourt, Jehan de Trie,  
Et pour estre mieulx la chose fournie,  
Demandez ent a l'amoureux Clifford.

This list of names indicates that Clifford, whoever he was, enjoyed the acquaintance of the most brilliant French society of the time.<sup>2</sup> "The Tourangoys" is Louis (brother of Charles VI), who became Duke of Touraine in 1386 and Duke of Orléans in 1392.<sup>3</sup> Le Breth is Charles d'Albret, the king's cousin-german. The Comte d'Eu is Philippe d'Artois. Harecourt is Jean VI, Comte d'Harcourt. Jean de Trie is the brother of the admiral

<sup>1</sup> No. 536, Vol. III, pp. 375, 376.

<sup>2</sup> The names are identified by RAYNAUD in his index to DESCHAMPS.

<sup>3</sup> Thus the poem was not written before 1386, and, since Louis gave up the duchy of Touraine to receive that of Orléans, it can hardly have been written after 1392.



Renaud de Trie; he was a marshal of France, and chamberlain of the dukes of Burgundy and Orléans. The Seneschal d'Eu himself was the main author of the famous *Livre des Cent Ballades*.<sup>1</sup>

Who was this Clifford? M. Gaston Raynaud, in his invaluable historical index to Deschamps, identifies him with Sir Lewis de Clifford, of whom he gives the following brief account: "Chevalier anglais, ami de Chaucer . . . . Il est cité par Froissart parmi les champions de la joute de Saint-Inglevert (1390), et fait aussi partie des ambassades anglaises de 1391 et de 1395." There is every reason to accept M. Raynaud's identification. Even if Deschamps had never written his address to Chaucer, we should still be justified in assuming acquaintanceship between the English poet and Sir Lewis Clifford, for the latter was not only a courtier of Richard II, but seems to have stood in close relation to John of Gaunt and his party, as will appear in what follows.<sup>2</sup>

Sir Lewis Clifford was one of the best known of English gentlemen, under the degree of a lord,<sup>3</sup> in the last quarter of the fourteenth century. He was born about 1336.<sup>4</sup> In 1352 he was taken prisoner by the French.<sup>5</sup> Later he was apparently attached to the household of the Black Prince, who made grants to him in 1368, 1372 and 1376,<sup>6</sup> and whose will he witnessed in 1376.<sup>7</sup> Clifford remained in this service after Prince Edward's death

<sup>1</sup> The MARQUIS DE QUEUX DE SAINTE-HILAIRE remarks, in a note on this poem of DESCHAMPS: "Cette ballade semble se rapporter au *Livre des cent ballades*" (*Œuvres de Deschamps*, Vol. III, p. 375). The device of proposing a question to the seneschal and asking him to consult different authorities certainly reminds one strongly of this charming work. The Comte d'Eu is one of the persons consulted in the *Livre des cent ballades* (no. 99), and one of the replies (p. 207) bears the name of Monseigneur de Touraine.

<sup>2</sup> A number of facts about Clifford are collected by MORANT (in his edition of WHITAKER's *Hist. and Antiq. of the Deanery of Craven*, 1878, pp. 314, 315), by MISS TOULMIN SMITH (*Derby Accounts*, p. 312), and by WYLIE (*Hist. of England under Henry the Fourth*, Vol. III, pp. 261, 296). See, especially, BELTZ, *Memorials of the Order of the Garter*, 1841, pp. 260 ff.

<sup>3</sup> He appears to have been related to the Barons of Clifford.

<sup>4</sup> In 1386 Clifford gave evidence in the famous Scrope-Grosvenor controversy, describing himself as above fifty years of age (*Scrope-Grosvenor Roll*, ed. NICOLAS, Vol. II, p. 427). Of course he may have been born some time before 1336. "Lois de Clifort" was in France in the army commanded by Robert d'Artois and the Earl of Pembroke in 1342 (FROISSART, ed. KERVYN, Vol. IV, p. 143).

<sup>5</sup> FROISSART, ed. KERVYN, Vol. V, p. 302. Cf. BELTZ, p. 261.

<sup>6</sup> Sept. 1, 42 Ed. III. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1377-81*, p. 158; *ibid.*, 1381-5, p. 33): July 20 in the thirtieth year of his principate (*ibid.*, 1381-5, p. 33); June 5, 50 Ed. III. (*ibid.*, p. 106). The Black Prince died June 8, 1376.

<sup>7</sup> He is called "knight" (*miles*) in the notarial certificate attached to the will (NICHOLS, *Wills of the Kings and Queens of England*, p. 76).

(1376) and during the principate of Richard (afterward Richard II), who made a grant to him in 1377.<sup>1</sup> In 1373 he had been with John of Gaunt in his *chevauchée* from Brittany to Bordeaux.<sup>2</sup> On the accession of Richard in 1377, or soon after (1378), Lewis Clifford became a knight of the king's household<sup>3</sup>—a position which he long retained. In 1378 the Princess Joan, widow of the Black Prince, granted him for her life the custody of Cardigan Castle, and this grant was confirmed, for Clifford's life, by the king in 1382.<sup>4</sup> The Princess Joan was a supporter of Wyclif, and it was perhaps in her household that Clifford formed those opinions which lend a singular interest to his career. Our first information as to these opinions comes from this same year, 1378, immediately after Richard's accession. At this time, Walsingham tells us, the bishops were remiss in prosecuting Wyclif, being terrified "a facie cujusdam, nec nobilis militis neque potentis, de Curia Principissae Johanne, videlicet Lodewyci Clyfford, pompose vetantis ne praesumerent aliquid contra ipsum Johannem sententialiter diffinire."<sup>5</sup> This is testimony from a hostile witness, the feeble spite of whose "nec nobilis neque potentis" we may well forgive in return for the picturesqueness of his "a facie" and especially his "pompose vetantis." Clifford was sufficiently distinguished<sup>6</sup> to be made a Knight of the Garter in this same year;<sup>7</sup> and, whether he was "powerful" or not, he had powerful backers in whatever demonstration he may have made, and it is clear that he acted with dash and spirit. Most important of all, he carried his point and cowed the bishops. That he had some understanding with John of Gaunt, the arch-patron of the Lollards,<sup>8</sup> would be

<sup>1</sup> Feb. 20 and 25, 51 Ed. III (*Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1377-81*, pp. 106, 156, 157); cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1381-5*, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> FROISSART, Vol. VIII, pp. 280, 284.

<sup>3</sup> He is so described ("king's knight") in a document of March 22, 1378 (1 Ric. II): *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1377-81*, p. 157.

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1381-5*, p. 185.

<sup>5</sup> *Hist. Angl.*, Vol. I, p. 356.

<sup>6</sup> So *nobilis* must doubtless be taken; for Clifford's family was noble enough if he was related to Lord Clifford (see p. 11, note 2).

<sup>7</sup> His predecessor, Ingelram de Coucy, retired August 26, 1377 (RYMER, 2d ed., HOLMES, Vol. VII, p. 172), and Clifford received robes for the feast of St. George (April 23), 1378 (*Wardrobe Accounts*). See BELTZ, *Memorials of the Order of the Garter*, pp. 152, 243, 246 ff., 262; NICOLAS, *Orders of Knighthood, The Garter*, p. 46\*, n. 4, App., pp. xxi\* ff., liii.

<sup>8</sup> KNIGHTON says of John of Gaunt: "semper ei [i. e. Wyclif] et suis in omnibus necessitatibus invincibili praesidio affuit, et aliter ipse et sui in foveam interitus viliter cecidissent." Vol. II, p. 157 (TWYSDEN, col. 2647).

extremely probable in any case. At all events, he was in the confidence of this great noble, as is shown by a singular bit of evidence in the public records. In that same year (1378), John of Gaunt obtained from Richard II a confirmation of a privilege previously granted by Edward III. Whenever the Duke should die, the revenues of his real estate were to be received and managed for one year, without interference from the crown officers, by certain designated persons, one of whom was Lewis Clifford.<sup>1</sup> In 1391 Clifford and others were sent to Paris with pacific messages from Richard II to Charles VI.<sup>2</sup>

Under the year 1382 Knighton mentions Lewis Clifford among the "promotores strenuissimi et propugnatores fortissimi" of the Lollards,<sup>3</sup> and under 1387 he is again referred to by Walsingham in similar terms.<sup>4</sup> He is continually mentioned in the Patent Rolls, usually in connection with some royal grant: 1378,<sup>5</sup> 1379,<sup>6</sup> 1380 (July 8 and August 3),<sup>7</sup> 1381,<sup>8</sup> 1382,<sup>9</sup> 1384,<sup>10</sup> 1385,<sup>11</sup> 1387.<sup>12</sup> In 1385 (May 4) he was in South Wales at Cardigan Castle, of which he was constable.<sup>13</sup> In 1389 he is several times mentioned as present at meetings of the Privy Council.<sup>14</sup> Thus we keep him in view without difficulty till 1390, when he appears with distinction in the brilliant pages of Froissart.

In 1389 a three years' truce was made between England and France. In November of the same year, three French knights, Regnault de Roy, the Sire de Saint-Py, and that very distinguished gentleman, Bouciquaut the younger, challenged all Christian knights to a tournament to be held in the following spring near the abbey of Saint-Inglevert, in the march of Calais,

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1377-81*, p. 282.

<sup>2</sup> FROISSART, Vol. XIV, pp. 284, 288, 355; cf. WALLON, *Richard II*, pp. 44, 45, 412, 413.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. II, p. 181 (Twysden, col. 2661).

<sup>4</sup> Among the knights who "hanc sectam coluerunt quam maxime et sustentaverunt" (*Hist. Angl.*, Vol. II, p. 159; *Ypodigma Neustriæ*, p. 348).

<sup>5</sup> *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1377-81*, pp. 170, 185, 208, 225.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 332.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 525, 529.

<sup>8</sup> *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1381-5*, p. 33.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 185.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 478.

<sup>11</sup> *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1385-9*, p. 53.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 310. From this entry it appears that his wife's name was Eleanor and that she was dead in 1387 (June 18).

<sup>13</sup> *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1381-5*, p. 569; cf. FROISSART, Vol. X, p. 394.

<sup>14</sup> *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, ed. NICOLAS, Vol. I, pp. 6, 11, 12d, 14b, 14c, 17.

promising to meet all comers for thirty days,<sup>1</sup>—"et prions à tous les nobles chevalliers et escuiers estranges qui venir y voudront, que point ne voellent penser, ne ymaginer que nous faisons ceste chose par orgueil, hayne, ne malvueillance, mais que pour les veoir et avoir leur honnourable compagnie et accointance, laquelle de tous nos coeurs entièrement nous désirons." Among the Englishmen who took part in the Tournament of Saint-Inglevert was Lewis Clifford, who is described by Froissart as "ung moult appert et vaillant chevallier." He jousted on the first day with both Saint-Py and Bouciquaut, and "on luy dist que vaillament et honnourablement il s'estoit porté."<sup>2</sup>

In 1390, soon after the great tournament, Clifford took part in the Duke of Bourbon's expedition to Barbary. John Beaufort, the eldest son of John of Gaunt and Katherine Swinford, led the English contingent,<sup>3</sup> but he was a mere youth, and there is good evidence that Clifford was its responsible commander.<sup>4</sup> This is additional testimony to the Duke's confidence in him. It is worth notice that among the Frenchmen who went to Barbary were the Comte d'Eu, the Comte d'Harcourt, and Charles d'Albret,<sup>5</sup> all of whom are mentioned in the envoy to the ballade in which Deschamps refers a question to the Seneschal d'Eu and suggests that he take counsel with "l'amoureux Clifford." In 1392 Henry, Earl of Derby, made an offering "in die anniuersarii filii Lowys Clifford."<sup>6</sup> In 1393 or 1394 Clifford was appointed executor

<sup>1</sup> FROISSART, ed. KERVYN, Vol. XIV, pp. 56, 57.

<sup>2</sup> FROISSART, Vol. XIV, pp. 110, 111. It is interesting to note that Sir Thomas Clifford (afterward Lord Clifford), probably a near relative of Sir Lewis, had formerly challenged Bouciquaut. A document given in RYMER (2d ed., HOLMES, Vol. VII, p. 526) from *Rot. Franc. 10 Ric. II*, and dated June 25 [1386], notifies "Northampton le Heraud" of his challenge and gives the king's permission to the herald "de passer vers les parties de France, parmy noz Enemys, a pursuers le dit Bosoigne en chescune part qui vous semblera le meultz." An entry in the Patent Rolls, 11 Ric. II, May 18, 1388 (*Cal.*, 1385-9, p. 447) refers to certain jousts and other feats of arms against the king's enemies the French, performed by the same Sir Thomas, at the request of the said enemies, in the presence of William de Beauchamp, Captain of Calais. In this same year he was one of the knights dismissed from the court when John of Gaunt lost power and Richard II submitted to the Duke of Gloucester's party (KNIGHTON, Vol. II, p. 257, TWYSDEN, col. 2705; WALSHINGHAM, *Hist. Angl.*, Vol. II, p. 173).

<sup>3</sup> FROISSART, Vol. XIV, p. 156.

<sup>4</sup> CABARET, *Chronique du bon Duc Loys de Bourbon*, ed. CHAZAUD, p. 249. This authority, who derived his information from a French knight who was a member of the expedition, gives the number of the English as twenty-five gentlemen and a hundred archers (p. 222).

<sup>5</sup> See DESCHAMPS's ballade on the expedition, No. 769, Vol. IV, p. 266; cf. FROISSART, Vol. XIV, pp. 155, 156.

<sup>6</sup> *Derby Accounts*, ed. TOULMIN SMITH, p. 275.

of the will of Isabel, Duchess of York.<sup>1</sup> In 1393 Lewis Clifford, knight of the king's chamber, was one of several commissioners sent to Picardy to negotiate for peace with France.<sup>2</sup> He was also, in 1395, one of the ambassadors sent to arrange for a marriage between Richard II and Isabel, daughter of Charles VI.<sup>3</sup>

Clifford seems to have remained true to his Lollard convictions until shortly before his death. In 1395 he is mentioned again by Walsingham among the "campi-ductores" of that sect,<sup>4</sup> though in the same year his name occurs in a list of Englishmen who had signified their desire to join the order of Chevaliers de la Passion projected by Philippe de Mézières.<sup>5</sup> In 1402, however, perhaps under the influence of failing health, his conscience began to trouble him. Despite the orthodox reaction, which was then in full swing, there were many secret adherents of Wycliffite doctrines, and Clifford gave the Archbishop of Canterbury information of their tenets, even furnishing him a list of heretical persons.<sup>6</sup> That this act, however it may affect the modern reader, was the result of passionate remorse, it would be brutal to doubt in view of Clifford's extraordinary and pathetic will, which was certainly drawn up when he was on his deathbed, since it is dated September 17, 1404, and was proved on the fifth of the following December.<sup>7</sup> In this he describes himself as "God's traitor" and directs that his vile carrion shall be buried in the farthest corner of the churchyard of the parish in which he dies, and that no stone or

<sup>1</sup> The will is said to have been proved January 6, 1392 (NICOLAS, *Testamenta Vetusta*, Vol. I, p. 135)—doubtless an error for 1394-95. The countess died in 1394. The connection of Clifford with the Lancaster family comes out in this and the preceding item. Henry of Derby was the son of John of Gaunt, and the Countess Isabel was the Duke's sister-in-law, the daughter of Pedro the Cruel.

<sup>2</sup> 16 Ric. II. The commission, dated February 22, 1392 (*i. e.*, 1393), is in RYMER, 2d ed., HOLMES, Vol. VII, p. 738. It mentions as the other commissioners the Dukes of Lancaster and Gloucester, Walter, Bishop of Durham, Thomas Earl Marshal, Thomas Percy, and Dr. Richard Rouhale.

<sup>3</sup> FROISSART, Vol. XV, pp. 147, 164, 194, 232.

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. Angl.*, Vol. II, p. 216; *Ypodigma Neustriæ*, p. 368.

<sup>5</sup> Published from the MS by MOLINIER, *Archives d'Orient Latin*, Vol. I, p. 363. The Duke of Lancaster appears in the same document (which is the work of Philippe himself) as one who has promised to aid the order. "Othe de Granson, chevalier d'honneur du roy d'Engleterre et du duc de Lencastre," is also mentioned by Philippe as particularly active in forwarding the new order.

<sup>6</sup> WALSHINGHAM, *Hist. Angl.*, Vol. II, p. 253; *Ypodigma*, p. 396.

<sup>7</sup> It is printed from the original in the Prerogative Court by DUGDALE, *Baronage of England*, Vol. I, pp. 341, 342.

other memorial shall mark the spot, in order that it may remain unknown forever.<sup>1</sup> Those scholars who have found incredible the story of Chaucer's deathbed repentance told by Dr. Thomas Gascoigne<sup>2</sup> may do well to consider this unquestionably authentic document, which expresses the last wishes of a very gallant and accomplished gentleman, a friend of Chaucer and of Deschamps, alike acceptable at the French court and the English, and apparently at one time an intimate associate of the brilliant circle of Louis d'Orléans.

Clifford's will contains a name of much interest to students of Chaucer. After certain small bequests, he leaves the residue of his goods and chattels to three persons, who are also made supervisors of his will. These three legatees were, we may be sure, trusted friends of the testator, and it is with some satisfaction, therefore, that the investigator observes among them Sir Thomas Clanvowe, who passes for the probable author of *The Book of Cupid*, otherwise known as *The Cuckoo and the Nightingale*, one of the most graceful and pleasing of the pseudo-Chaucerian poems. Before we proceed, however, it will be necessary to consider how far the evidence justifies Professor Skeat in ascribing this poem to Sir Thomas.

*The Book of Cupid* is followed in one manuscript<sup>3</sup> by the words explicit Clanvowe," and there is no reason to doubt that Clanvowe was the author's name.<sup>4</sup> There are but two candidates for the honor, Sir John and Sir Thomas, and Professor Skeat decides for the latter.<sup>5</sup> His main reason appears to be the title, *The Boke of Cupide, God of Love*, which he thinks is imitated from that of a poem by Hoccleve, *Liber Cupidinis Dei Amoris*. Hoccleve's

<sup>1</sup> WYLIE, *History of England under Henry IV*, Vol. III, p. 296, n. 2, cites similar provisions from the will of Sir Thomas Latimer, another repentant Lollard. Latimer's will is dated September 13, 1401, and was proved May 21, 1402. It appoints Sir Lewis Clifford one of the "overseers of this my will" (NICOLAS, *Testamenta Vetusta*, Vol. I, pp. 158, 159). Latimer's wife died in 1402, and also made Clifford a supervisor (*ibid.*, p. 160).

<sup>2</sup> The passage is not given in the volume of extracts from GASCOIGNE edited by THOROLD ROGERS (*Loci e Libro Veritatum*, Oxford, 1881), but it was printed from the manuscript by HALES in *The Athenæum* for March 31, 1888, and again in his *Folia Litteraria*, pp. 110, 111. Professor Hales's reflections on the anecdote are judicious and temperate.

<sup>3</sup> Camb. Univ. Library, Ff. 1. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Professor SKEAT was the first to note this (*Academy*, May 2, 1896, p. 365; see also his *Chaucerian and Other Pieces*, 1897, pp. lvii ff.).

<sup>5</sup> He is followed by VOLLMEYER, in his edition of the poem (Berlin, 1898), pp. 53 ff.

poem was written in 1402,<sup>1</sup> and Sir John died, it is thought, in 1391. But there is no force in the argument. The supposed imitation consists merely in adding to the name *Cupid* the phrase *god of love*, and it is impossible to attach any importance to such a commonplace.<sup>2</sup>

All other tests yield results quite as favorable to Sir John as to Sir Thomas. The author appears to have known and utilized Chaucer's *Parliament of Fowls*, and his *Prologue to the Legend of Good Women*. Here there is no difficulty, for the former is usually dated about 1382 and the latter about 1385; nor, if these dates are rejected, is there any temptation to bring either of the two works down to 1390. Again, the first two lines of *The Book of Cupid* reproduce vss. 927 and 928 of *The Knight's Tale*, but this is thought to have been written not later than 1390, and may be earlier. There is, then, nothing in the sources of Clanvowe's poem to make Sir Thomas a better candidate than Sir John. Sir John was alive in 1390, since he went on the Barbary expedition in that year.

In st. 57, it is proposed that the birds shall assemble on

The morow of seynt Valentynes day,  
Under the maple that is feire and grene,  
Before the chambre wyndowe of the queene  
At Wodestok, upon the grene lay (vss. 282-5).

By "the queen" Skeat understands Joan of Navarre, who married Henry IV in 1403, and who received, perhaps as a part of her dower, the manor and park of Woodstock. But the reference may just as well be to Anne of Bohemia, wife of Richard II, whom Sir John Clanvowe, a knight of the king's household, would naturally have delighted to honor. It so happens that Richard and Anne kept their Christmas at Woodstock in 1390,<sup>3</sup> and no doubt they were there on other occasions at about this date.

<sup>1</sup> This date is in the poem itself.

<sup>2</sup> The list of fancied imitations of Hoccleve, drawn up by VOLLMER, pp. 59 ff., is of no significance.

<sup>3</sup> WALSINGHAM, *Hist. Angl.*, Vol. II, p. 195. E. MARSHALL, *Early History of Woodstock Manor*, 1873, p. 104, says that they kept their Christmas at Woodstock in 1389 and 1390, but both his entries really go back to this passage of Walsingham, whose 1390 equals 1389, since he begins his year at Christmas.

Finally, there is nothing whatever in the language of *The Book of Cupid* that forbids our putting it as early as 1389 or 1390. Indeed, the treatment of final *-e* is more favorable to that date than to Skeat's 1403, since, as that scholar himself has observed, the author is quite as inclined to preserve this sound as Chaucer.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, Professor Skeat regards his metre in this particular as "for the fifteenth century, quite unique." It is difficult to make up one's mind on so troublesome a question as the chronology of *-e* in Middle English, but it is safe to say that the language of *The Book of Cupid* points to 1390 or earlier, rather than to 1403.

All things considered, then, it seems rather more likely that the Clanvowe to whom the Cambridge MS ascribes our poem was Sir John Clanvowe than that it was Sir Thomas.

John de Clanvowe was the son of Philip de Clanvowe,<sup>2</sup> a Herefordshire gentleman who was M. P. for that county in 1322, 1339, and 1340,<sup>3</sup> and who held other important public offices.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. VOLLMER (p. 75, n.): "Sicherlich ist der vf. des gedichts, sei es, dass für seinen dialekt der process des verstummens des finalen *-e* weniger rasch vor sich gegangen ist, sei es, dass der einfluss Chaucer's auf ihn so mächtig war, in dem genannten punkte weniger weit gediehen, als zb. zeitgenossen wie Lydgate und Capgrave." SKEAT regards him as even more conservative than Chaucer (*Chaucerian Pieces*, pp. lix-lx).

<sup>2</sup> *Parliamentary Returns*, Vol. I, p. 143 (*Parl. Papers*, 1878, Vol. LXII, Part I): "Johannes, fil' Philippi de Clanvowe" (1348). Cf. W. R. WILLIAMS, *Parl. Hist. of the County of Hereford* (Brecknock, 1896), p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> *Parl. Returns*, Vol. I, pp. 67, 126, 130; cf. WILLIAMS, as above, pp. 18, 22. Williams remarks that Clanvowe also "received a special summons to Parliament 18 Aug., 1337" (p. 18). It is not quite certain that the M. P. of 1322 was the same Philip as the M. P. of 1339 and 1340 (see next note).

<sup>4</sup> There were two persons of this name (probably father and son or uncle and nephew) in Herefordshire and Wales in the fourteenth century. One of these was an adherent of Thomas, Earl of Lancaster in the proceedings that led to the death of Piers Gaveston, and his name occurs, with many others, in a pardon issued in 1313 (*Parliamentary Writs*, ed. PALGRAVE, Appendix to Vol. II, Div. II, p. 68). The same Philip appears to be referred to in 1321, 1322, 1323, and 1324 (*Parl. Writs*, as above, pp. 166, 212, 235, 249, 255; cf. Vol. II, Div. III, p. 679; *Cal. Close Rolls Ed. II, 1318-23*, p. 430). It was perhaps this same Philip who was deputy justice in South Wales in 1334 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls Ed. III, 1334-38*, p. 20) and who, in 1335 and 1336, was one of two commissioners to protect the harbors of Wales against the Scots (*Rotuli Scotiae*, Vol. I, pp. 365, 379, 427). He seems to be mentioned as living in 1339 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls Ed. III, 1338-40*, p. 279, cf. p. 284) and to have died in that same year (*Cal. Inq. post Mortem*, Vol. II, p. 91). See also C. J. ROBINSON, *Castles of Herefordshire*, 1869, pp. 40, 41. This elder (?) Philip may have been the M. P. of 1322. The second Philip (to whom some of the preceding entries may refer) is mentioned (probably) in 1338, 1339, and (certainly) in 1340, 1341, and 1344 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls Ed. III, 1338-40*, pp. 135, 502; 1340-43, p. 155; 1343-45, p. 395; *Cal. Close Rolls Ed. III, 1339-41*, pp. 282, 317, 436, 490). He was doubtless the M. P. of 1339 and certainly the M. P. of 1340; perhaps he was also the M. P. of 1322. In 1346 he owned real estate in Yavesore, Okel Pychard, and Houton, in Herefordshire (*Feudal Aids*, Vol. II, pp. 391, 394, 397). Sir John appears to have been his son. The name *Clanvowe* is spelled in many ways—*Clawenogh*, *Clavenow*, *Clevenowe*, *Clanewowe*, *Clannowe*, *Clannou*, *Clanvow(e)*, etc.



John Clanvowe was himself M. P. for the county in 1348.<sup>1</sup> In 1373 he received from Edward III a grant of £50 a year, mostly from the farm of the city of Hereford.<sup>2</sup> In 1376 he is mentioned as a mainpernor.<sup>3</sup> On the accession of Richard II, or soon after, he became (like Clifford) a Knight of the King's Chamber,<sup>4</sup> a position which he seems to have retained till his death. He is continually mentioned in the Patent Rolls from 1379 on, sometimes for grants, often in connection with the public service. Thus in 1381 and 1385 he was a commissioner to survey the condition of Wales;<sup>5</sup> in 1382 and 1383 he was a justice;<sup>6</sup> in 1386 he was directed to survey Orewell<sup>7</sup> on the strength of a report that the French king was planning an invasion in that quarter.<sup>8</sup> In 1381 he was made steward of the king's lordship of Haverford in Wales for life and constable of Haverford Castle,<sup>9</sup> and in 1385 he obtained a grant "of the town, castle, and lordship" of Haverford, "to hold as fully as the king's father held the same."<sup>10</sup> The entries enable us to keep him in view in 1379, 1381, 1382, 1383, 1385, 1386, 1390.<sup>11</sup>

Sir John Clanvowe was well known in France and is several times mentioned by Froissart. He was with Sir John Chandos when that distinguished knight was mortally wounded at the Lussac bridge in 1369.<sup>12</sup> He was one of the English ambassadors at the convention of Lelinghen, in 1389, which arranged for a three years' truce with France.<sup>13</sup> This truce immediately preceded the famous Tournament of Saint-Inglevert.<sup>14</sup> Sir John was an associate of Sir Lewis Clifford, and there can be little doubt

<sup>1</sup> *Parl. Returns*, Vol. I, p. 143; cf. WILLIAMS, as above, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II*, 1377-81, p. 323 (a confirmation of the grant).

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, Vol. II, p. 327.

<sup>4</sup> At least as early as 1381 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II*, 1381-85, p. 17); cf. p. 8, and 1377-81, p. 627.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 1381-85, pp. 17, 575.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 138, 246, 285.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. CHAUCER, *C. T.*, Prol., vs. 277.

<sup>8</sup> *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II*, 1385-89, p. 214.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 1377-81, p. 627.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 1385-89, pp. 14, 33.

<sup>11</sup> See, besides the places already cited, *Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II*, 1377-81, p. 406; 1381-85, pp. 8, 104, 153, 164, 214; 1385-89, pp. 130, 169, 173; 1388-92, pp. 173 (cf. RYMER, 2d ed., HOLMES, Vol. VII, pp. 654, 655), 217, 361.

<sup>12</sup> FROISSART, Vol. VII, pp. 447, 449, 456, 458.

<sup>13</sup> The commission is dated November 26, 1388 (RYMER, 2d ed., HOLMES, Vol. VII, pp. 610, 612, 613); see also FROISSART, Vol. XIV, p. 4; cf. Vol. XIII, p. 318. WALSHINGHAM also mentions Clanvowe as on this embassy (*Hist. Angl.*, Vol. II, pp. 179, 182).

<sup>14</sup> See p. 10, above.

that the two were close friends. Both were knights of the king's household, and there is a record of their being present together at a meeting of the Privy Council (1389).<sup>1</sup> In 1380 they were both executors of the will of Guichard d'Angle, Earl of Huntingdon.<sup>2</sup> Like Clifford, Clanvowe was a Lollard, and the two knights are mentioned in the same breath by Walsingham among the "milites qui hanc sectam coluerunt quam maxime et sustentaverunt" in 1387.<sup>3</sup> In 1390 Clanvowe accompanied Sir Lewis Clifford to Barbary in the Duke of Bourbon's expedition.<sup>4</sup> It is not certain that he ever returned. He is thought to have died before April, 1390,<sup>5</sup> or, at the latest, in 1391. According to Froissart,<sup>6</sup> he was one of the envoys who visited the French king at Tours in the winter of 1391-92 and arranged for the Conference of Amiens. There is positive evidence that his death took place before March 4, 1392.<sup>7</sup> Sir Thomas Clanvowe, whom Clifford appointed as one of his supervisors, and to whom Skeat ascribes *The Book of Cupid*, was probably the son of Sir John.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, ed. NICOLAS, Vol. I, p. 6. Clanvowe is several times mentioned in the records in the same volume (pp. 7, 9, 14a, 14c, 88).

<sup>2</sup> NICOLAS, *Testamenta Vestuta*, Vol. I, p. 109. In 1385 they were executors of the will of Joan, Princess of Wales (NICHOLS, *Wills of the Kings and Queens of England*, p. 80).

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. Angl.*, Vol. II, p. 159; *Ypodigma Neustriæ*, p. 348.

<sup>4</sup> CABARET (*Chronique du bon Duc Louis de Bourbon*, p. 222) calls him simply the "sire de Climbo;" but Malvern, the continuator of Higden, supplies the necessary identification by giving the initial of his first name (HIGDEN, ed. LUMBY, *Appendix*, Vol. IX, p. 234—"dominus J. Clanvowe"). WYLIE (*Hist. of England under Henry IV*, Vol. III, p. 261) says that it was Sir Thomas who went to Barbary, and in this error he is followed by SKEAT (*Chaucerian Pieces*, p. lviii) and by VOLLMER.

<sup>5</sup> NICOLAS, *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, Vol. I, p. 88.

<sup>6</sup> Vol. XIV, pp. 355, 356. FROISSART also makes him one of Clifford's associates in the negotiations of 1391 (Vol. XIV, p. 288), but this is perhaps an error (cf. p. 284).

<sup>7</sup> In the Issue Roll, 15 Ric. II, March 4, payment is recorded to Peter de Hiltoft, king's engraver, for the engraving of a seal for the office of steward of the lordship of Haverford, which lordship "by the death of John Clanvowe (printed *Clannowe*) hath now come into the King's hands." DEVON, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 246.

<sup>8</sup> I have found the following evidence. Thomas Clanvowe is mentioned as the king's esquire in 1391 (*Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1388-92*, p. 496), and this would be natural if his father had been Sir John, who was long a knight of the king's chamber. Thomas was M. P. for Herefordshire in 1394 and 1397 (*Parl. Returns*, Vol. I, pp. 247, 253; cf. WILLIAMS, *Parl. Hist. of the County of Hereford*, pp. 28, 29) and Sheriff in 1398, 1399 (WILLIAMS, p. 28; cf. Lancaster record quoted by WYLIE, Vol. IV, p. 184). Sir John and his father Philip had held these same offices. All this suggests that Sir Thomas was Sir John's heir and recognized representative. In 1428 Robert Whiteney is assessed for a fee in Ocle Pichard "nuper Philippi Clanvowe" (*Feudal Aids*, Vol. II, p. 415). Now Thomas Clanvowe's wife was Perrine Wheteney, who had been in the queen's service (*Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1388-92*, p. 496; cf. p. 250). She survived him and her will was proved in 1422 (J. CHALLENGER C. SMITH, *Index of the Wills proved in the Prerog. Court of Canterbury 1383-1558*, Vol. I, p. 121). Again, Philip

The career of Sir John Clanvowe was much like that of Sir Lewis Clifford except at the end: there is nothing to show that Clanvowe gave up his Lollard opinions. Both were men of note in their day and active in the public service at home and abroad. Their acquaintance with Chaucer must have been intimate,<sup>1</sup> and it is pleasant to know that it was in part a literary friendship: Clifford brought the greetings of Deschamps to the English poet, and Clanvowe was Chaucer's poetical disciple.

If the inferences in this paper are sound, we have two pieces of evidence for dating Chaucer's works: (1) the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* perhaps alludes to a poem composed by Deschamps before 1386, and may have been written not very long after that poem; and (2) *The Knight's Tale* is quoted by Clanvowe in a poem written before 1392, and probably before 1391.

G. L. KITTREDGE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,  
March, 1903.

Clanvowe had half a fee in Yavesor (Yasor) (*Feudal Aids*, Vol. II, p. 391); Sir Thomas's will, proved 1410, appears to be dated at this place (*Genealogist*, Vol. V, p. 326), and his widow's certainly is. Finally, his will mentions a former vicar of Ocle, and Philip Clanvowe held property in Ocle Pychard, as we have seen, and is said to have been lord of the manor. WYLIE, *Hist. of England under Henry IV*, Vol. III, pp. 297, 333, has collected some information about Sir Thomas and other Clanvowes, but it needs correction.

<sup>1</sup> It is not impossible that Chaucer's son "litell Lowis," for whom he wrote the *Treatise on the Astrolabe*, was named after Sir Lewis Clifford. The name Lewis is not known to have belonged to any of Chaucer's kin.